



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE WASHINGTON PEDIGREE; CORRIGENDA AND
ADDENDA.

BY CHARLES H. BROWNING.

I.

THE MOTHER OF MR. LAWRENCE WASHINGTON, A GRAND-
FATHER OF GENERAL WASHINGTON.

There has never been a controversy as to who was the mother of Mr. Lawrence Washington, the eldest son of Colonel John Washington, of Washington parish, Westmoreland County, Virginia, and the grandfather of General George Washington. In fact, there has never been any doubt as to her name, and whose daughter she was. Ask any of the many "Colonial Dames" and "Colonial Warsmen," lineal descendants of Mr. Lawrence Washington, who she was, and these concerned will readily reply: "Ann Pope." To them there is no question about it, because they had used her father, Colonel Nathaniel Pope, of Virginia, as a "claim," either original or supplementary, with the consent of their Society's Genealogist.

But the fact is, the ladies and gentlemen of Washington blood are not descended from Colonel Pope, because his daughter Ann, tho a wife of Colonel John Washington, was not the mother of Colonel Washington's son and heir Lawrence, their ancestor, and I hope that herein I shall convince them, and the pedigree examiners, that they have erred in this item of the Washington genealogy, by telling how I know it. But I have to admit that the alleged "examiners" all over the Union, are, in a way, not to be blamed altogether for the mistake, because they naturally relied

upon the many printed Washington pedigrees and could have believed the writers of them had personally substantiated all their statements before publishing.

As will appear hereafter, young Captain John Washington, who had been living in Virginia, first in Northumberland Co., and next in Westmoreland Co., for several years, returned from a short visit to England, before April, 1655.

It may have been before going on this voyage, or immediately upon his return from his visit to Tring, a market town, in Hertfordshire, that he married his first wife, a young widow, with one child, and also a resident of Westmoreland, when he was about 24–26 years of age. The exact date and place of this wedding are still conjectural, but the lady's maiden name is certainly unknown at this writing, so far as I am aware. However, this latter item would only be nice to know, for it does not affect my story. The lady whom Captain (and he may have been a Major, as will be explained) John Washington married as his first wife (but not in the sense that he was going to accumulate wives), was Mrs. Ann Brett. She was the widow of Mr. Henry Brett, sometime a merchant of Plymouth, Devonshire, but at the time of his decease a land owner and resident of Westmoreland Co., Va., who died intestate, and Washington administered his estate, after he married Mrs. Brett, as appears from the following Court items.

Westmoreland Court Order Book, under date of 28 Sep., 1670, is a Statement of Account of Henry Brett's Estate, "exhibited by Lt. Col. John Washington, who married Ann, the relict of Mr. Henry Brett, late of ye county dec'd." A commission reported "We have examined ye whole Inventory & Debts of ye said Henry Brett, and Wee Doe find that Mrs. Ann Brett Washington hath paid beyond the Assatts," &c.

And *ibid*, under 31 May, 1671, find that Mrs. Ann (Brett) Washington's son, Samuel Brett, a merchant at

Plymouth, gave power of attorney "to execute a discharge to Lt. Col. Washington, who intermarried with Mrs. Ann Brett, ye relict and Admin'trix of Henry Brett, of Plymouth, merchant, dec'd."

These items, while they confirm the marriage of John Washington and the Widow Brett, his first wife, do not tell us when Mr. Brett died, nor when Mrs. Washington died, but this happened certainly before Feb. 1658-59, as will appear. In their short married life, they had three children, namely Lawrence, John and Ann, as also will be shown.

It was probably after this 1671 item, when Samuel Brett* testified that Washington had administered the estate of Brett Sr. so satisfactorily that he ran in debt to Washington thru some trading account, and Lawrence Washington, as his father's executor, had to sue his half-brother for balance of the account, £21.4.5 ster. This suit was brought against Samuel's Virginia attorney, as Brett was then a merchant at Bristol, 14 June, 1682, before a Westmoreland County Court, of which Lawrence was one of the Justices. Sometime later, Samuel's lawyer, as defence, brought a counter claim against the estate of John Washington for £100 ster., to pay for damages to a sloop, belonging to Samuel, which Washington had used to take his cattle, horses, &c., over to Maryland, in April, 1676, "as may more largely appear" below. The jury decided in favor of Lawrence.

A very short time after his first wife died, leaving him with three young children, John Washington married his second wife, who was Mrs. Ann Brodhurst, the widow and relict, and apparently the second wife, of Walter Brodhurst, who removed from Maryland to Northumberland Co., where he was the sheriff in 1652,

* There was a Samuel Brett, who married in 1647, in St. Andrew parish, Plymouth, who may have been brother to Henry, who named his son for him.

and a burgess next year, and then was seated in Westmoreland, when it was formed from Northumberland, and the daughter of Lieut. Colonel Nathaniel Pope, of Westmoreland Co., a near neighbor to Washington.

In this way it appears as if Ann Pope, a young woman, was the second wife of Walter Brodhurst, and that his first was one of the daughters of Lt. Col. Thomas Gerrard. Brodhurst and Gerrard had been neighbors in Maryland and removed together to Northumberland Co., 1650. Gerrard in his will, dated 1 Feb. 1672-3, says he married twice, and had issue by each wife. He had five daughters (and several sons, one John, of whom hereafter), but named only two, and a lot of grandchildren through them, but named only two, Gerrard Tucker and Gerrard Peyton, a son of daughter Frances, who was the wife of several prominent Virginians, and then became the third wife of Lt. Col. Washington. Possibly Brodhurst's son, Gerrard, was also one of his unnamed grandchildren, and well enough off not to need a special legacy.

Brodhurst's will, dated 26 Jan., 1658-9, proved by the witnesses at his house, and presented in Court, 12 Feb. following by his widow, Ann, born Pope, as its executrix. According to the will, she was so to act, excepting as to his land he desired "my son Gerrard" to have. His arrangement for his widow was not generous. As long as she remained his widow and unmarried, she was to have the use of his land, cattle, horses, &c., but for this she should pay rental to his will overseers, Col. Gerrard, possibly his first father-in-law, and Col. Pope, his second father-in-law, who should use the money for the up-keep and education of his children. From this, it looks as if Gerrard was to look after the welfare of his namesake, if not his grandson, Gerrard Brodhurst, and Pope to do the same for his daughter's son, Walter. That young Gerrard Brodhurst may have had some trouble in getting some of his

inheritance from his father's estate, appears through a quit-claim deed, dated 20 Sep. 1668, from "Mrs. Ann Brodhurst" (whom we have reasons to imagine was then "Mrs. John Washington"), by which she assigned 500 acres of land, which, after 1675, lay in Stafford Co., to her stepson, Gerrard Brodhurst.

The exact date of the marriage of John Washington and Mrs. Brodhurst is unknown, and so is that of the death of Mr. Brodhurst. Both dates remain hypothetical. Mr. Brodhurst's will, which was dated 26 Jan. 1658-9, was not filed till in Nov., 1659, and the inventory of his personal estate on 17 April, 1661, therefore, we got no information from these sources, or only that Washington seems to have lost no time in getting a second wife to mind the infants of his previous one, and look out for his comfort. However, there is a suggestive, tho not convincing, item extant which shows Major Washington must have married Mrs. Brodhurst around Feb., 1658-9, which I shall bring up.

There are two good items extant that approximate the time of their wedding. One, dated 12 Feb., 1658-9, a recorded paper in which Ann's father, Lt. Col. Pope, styled her "my daughter Ann Pope Brodhurst."

The other item, dated 11 May, 1659, also signed with his "mark" by Lt. Col. Pope, is a power of attorney concerning some land, addressed to his daughter Ann, in which he calls her "My daughter Ann Pope *alias* Washington."

Therefore it may be seen that John Washington and his second Ann, another widow with a son, married early in the year 1659, and before May, certainly, if the "young son" baptised on 4 Oct. was her first child and not the last one of the first wife of Col. John.

In the Spring of 1659, John Washington went on one of his trading voyages abroad, and returned to Virginia in Sep. On the 29 Sep., 1659, the Governor of Maryland wrote him a letter, which he received by

messenger in Westmoreland Co., at his home, in which the Governor requested him to attend a Maryland Court on the following 4 Oct., to testify in a criminal case, instituted by Col. Washington, concerning the brutal hanging by the sailors of a woman passenger, believed by them to be a witch, and that she had hoodooed their ship, in which Washington was coming over to Virginia, and caused it several times to get on the wrong course. (See Neill's "Virginia-Carolorum," pp. 257-8).

In reply to this request, Col. Washington wrote to the Governor, by his messenger, a note dated 30 Sep., 1659, saying (*ibid*), that it was impossible for him to attend that Court on 4 Oct. following, "because then, [4 Oct. 1659], God willing, I intend to gett my young son baptised. All ye company and Gossips being already invited." [The full text of this letter may be read in vol. XVI, p. 264, this mag.].

Thus, we have virtually the record of the date of the baptism of John, Jr., the youngest son of Col. John Washington, for we may presume he was baptised on 4 Oct., 1659. This being a child of Col. John's first wife, deceased, and born in 1658, before Feb., 1658-9, there may be many causes imagined why he was not baptised before this, or during his mother's lifetime. There are at least two probable reasons worth suggesting. The child's mother may have died giving birth to it, and its father had not yet arrived home from his voyage. John, Jr., was 17 years of age when his father made his will, in which he desired that Thomas Pope, the lad's step-uncle, should "have the care of his bringing up" and educating.

When Col. Washington made his will, dated either 11, or 21 (writing indistinct), Sept., 1675, he named as executors his then wife (Anne [Pope] Brodhurst), his brother Lawrence, who predeceased him, and "my son Lawrence." The date of his death has not been

found. The will was proved, and filed in Westmoreland County Court 10 Jan., 1677-8, by his son and heir, Lawrence (Ann Pope, his wife, not acting for reason hereafter explained), he being the heir, and then of age and naturally had livery of his inheritance, and succeeded his father.

This is another of the reasons why Lawrence could not have been the child of Ann Pope ("her second son" it has been printed), because she and Col. John were married early, probably, in Feb., 1658-9, and Lawrence would have been only 18 or 19 years old in 1677-8, and not of age. Whereas he was born early in 165—, (1655-6), hence was the son of Col. John's first wife, Mrs. Ann Brett.

But the proof that Lawrence, John, and Ann, were the children of Col. John by his first wife is more convincing through the following extracts from the wills of Col. John Washington and his sons, Lawrence and John. See Mr. Ford's "Washington Wills," which may be assumed are reliable copies of the originals (tho his footnotes to them are not always that), or, better, Dr. Toner's copies printed in Waters' "Gleanings in English Wills," pp. 524, &c., and W. and M. Quart., *XIII*, p. 145, will of John Jr.

Col. Washington wrote into his will, on 11 (or 21) of Sept., 1675: "My body to be buried in ye plantation where I now live, by the side of My Wife yt is already buried."

As his second wife (frequently mentioned in this will, and named as one of its executors), Mrs. Ann Brodhurst ("Ann Pope that was") was living, and presumably with him, when he wrote this desire, Col. John could have only referred to his first wife, the Widow Brett, as being the wife, "yt is already buried," before May, 1659. However, his wife, Widow Brodhurst, survived Col. John and died in England, as below.

Lawrence Washington, Col. John's eldest son and

heir, in his will, dated 11 March, 1697-8, desired to be buried "by the side of my father and mother."

Therefore, Col. John Washington was buried as he wished to be, beside his first wife, "already buried" there, in the Washington graveyard, on the homestead plantation, Westmoreland Co., and his son Lawrence was buried next to them, and near several half-brothers and half-sisters.

John Washington, Jr., Col. John's second son, and last child by his first wife, in his will, dated Washington parish, 22 January, 1697-8 (proved 23 Feb. following), desired that his body be "buried by my father and mother and brothers."

These I presume were step-brothers (brother Lawrence being alive), because Mrs. Brett-Washington could not have had more than three children in her short married life with Col. John, unless there were "twins, or better."

Here, we have the proof in two wills that Lawrence and John Jr. were sons of Col. John's first wife, and you will see by the Colonel's will that his daughter, Ann, was also her child, and that their own mother, the wife of Col. John, was buried in the plantation graveyard, before Sep., 1675.

Since, as related below, Washington's second wife (Ann Pope), died in Salop, England, while among her first husband's relatives, and was buried there by them, and there is not the slightest hint of contemporary record, nor likelihood probably, that her body was disinterred and brought to Virginia, by Lawrence's or John Jr.'s order, Lawrence and John were buried by the side of Mrs. Ann Brett-Washington, and were not the sons of (Mrs. Ann Pope) Brodhurst-Washington, and were only step-sons.

Taking up Col. John Washington's will again, read what he says of his children:—"My wife (i. e. his then wife, Ann Pope, who survived him) to have the "bring-

ing up of my daughter, Ann Washington, until my son, Lawrence comes of age.”

This item shows the Colonel’s particular consideration for his own, and not his and his then wife’s, Ann Pope, children. Lawrence at that writing was about 19 years old, and may be presumed to have been so manly and educated that he required no further “bringing up” by anyone, nor was a guardian suggested for him during his minority, in the event that his father might be killed in the Bacon war, or rebellion, or in the coming conflict with the Indians, both threatened at this time, and the Colonel realized he would soon be in active military duty as a commander, hence he made his will.

[It is a rather remarkable coincidence about the two brothers, John and Lawrence Washington, the immigrants, and worthy of note here, that John’s will was dated 21 Sept., 1675, and filed in Court on 10 Jan., 1677–8, and that of Lawrence being dated 27 Sep., 1675, was filed in the same Court on 6 Jan., 1677–8.]

Even then, his father realized that young Lawrence would be competent to look after his own young sister, and it would be more natural that he should do so, rather than to be continued at the command of her step-mother, especially at so important period of her young life when there would be wooers acoming. Therefore, it may be assumed, that when his father died, Lawrence, as the head of the House, not only took charge of his sister, without their step-mother having to resign her, he being then of age, which was the condition in the will. Should he not have been of full age, the Court would have been obliged to appoint someone to administer the Colonel’s estate until he was, and the Court Order Book shows no such order, hence, again, he could not have been Ann Pope’s child.

I think nothing more is needed to identify young Ann as, like Lawrence and John, Jr., a child of Col. John by his first wife, Widow Brett, than the following item

from her father's will. After having given "to my daughter Ann" two tracts of land, containing 1200 and 1400 acres each, he says:—"I give to my say'd Daughter, wch was her mother's desire, and my promise, ye Cash in ye new parlour, & the Diamond ringe, & her Mother's rings, & the white quilt & the white curtains & vallians."

There is still another important item to record here, suggesting about when Lawrence was born, and showing he must have been the child of his father's first wife, and could not have been the son of Ann Pope, the second wife, whom Col. John did not marry till after Jan., 1658-9, and before 11 May, 1659.

In 1679, Mr. Lawrence Washington was appointed one of H. M. Justices of the C. P. Court, the Westmoreland County Court. (ex V. H. M., I., 250), and was still a member in 1682-3 (ex W. & M. Q., IV., 87), and in 1685, when he is styled Captain, (W. & M. Quart., Vol. XV, p. 186), and probably was a captain when young. If Lawrence had been any child, or the first, of Col. Washington by his second wife, Ann Pope, married possibly in Feb., 1658-9, he would have been too young, not even of age, to be a Justice. But as the son of Col. Washington by his first wife, Mrs. Ann Brett, he was 23 or 25 or more years of age, and quite eligible to sit on the Bench, in 1679-80.

II.

WAS COL. JOHN WASHINGTON A BIGAMIST?

Such a query as this is not intended to be a malicious dissemination, as it is intended only as the title of a case stated, the hypothesis being:—When a man and woman live together, and he has acknowledged her as his wife, and, at a certain date, there is evidence that they were then living together in harmony, but in less than eight months afterwards he openly marries another woman,

and the former presumed wife goes abroad, and centuries afterwards there is not found any record of the decree of divorce, legally separating the man from the departed woman, who had been living with him as his wife for about seventeen years, what is the inference?

In our present-day life, we may, under these circumstances, assume the discarded woman was only a "common-law wife," a concubine, and that theirs had not been a legal union, and consequently their issue was illegitimate.

But as to this suppositious statement, and also the query, we are advised, as a counter to it, that we should not judge actions of centuries ago by our present-day methods. Therefore, we should allow there was a separation legally confirmed, a divorce, legally granted and duly recorded somewhere, which evidence has not been discovered up to this time.

As already stated, Major John Washington, of Washington parish, Westmoreland Co., of the church of which he was elected a vestryman in July, 1661, married, when 30 years of age, his second wife, the widow, Ann (Pope) Brodhurst, possibly in Feb., 1658-9, or even later, before May, 1659.

This union, as you shall see, took place before the 11th of May, 1659, when it was acknowledged by Ann's father, but the wedding day is not of record. Ann's former husband signed his will on 26 Jan., 1658-9, and it was presented in Court for probate 12 Feb., 1658-9, but some testamentary proceedings here and in England, in the P. C. C., where it also had to be filed, delayed its filing here till the Nov. term of the Court, 1659. Also on the same date, 12 Feb., 1658-9, Ann's father, Col. Pope, executed a deed to her for land, in which he called her "my daughter Ann Pope Brodhurst," hence, it may be presumed she did not marry John Washington till after this date.

But it looks as if Ann shed her weeds for a veil a very

short time after 26 Jan., 1658-9, or after she had buried Brodhurst, as her father, Lt. Col. Nathaniel Pope, also a planter in Westmoreland Co., in a power of attorney to her about some land, dated 11 May, 1659, as above, styled her "My daughter Ann Pope, *alias* Washington." In his will (which he "marked," for possibly Col. Pope could not write, as all of his extant papers bear only "His Mark"), dated a few days later, or on 16 May, 1659, written just before going to England (proved in Virginia 20 April, 1660), he gave, or rather forgave, "to my son-in-law, John Washington," a debt of eighty pounds money, which John, he said, owed him.

And there is a recorded grant of 700 acres of land in Westmoreland, to Mrs. Ann Pope *alias* Washington, dated 13 June, 1661. [With no intention to suggest anything like it in this case, it may be remarked here that in England, Ireland, and the B. W. I., when there are papers of court record in which the woman living with a man as his wife, "but not parsoned" or married to him, she is described this way in old records, "Mary Smith *alias* Jones," her name and the surname of the man, to identify her.]

After this union, the next great event in the lives of John and Ann was, so far as I know, the christening of John's last child by his first wife (Widow Brett), on 4 Oct., 1659, referred to before, the date of whose birth is unknown.

On the 20th of this month and year, as "Mrs. Ann Brodhurst (she being Major Washington's wife on 11 May, we have seen), she was present in the Westmoreland Court, and as "the relict (but not the widow, because she had married again since his decease), and adm'trix of Mr. Walter Brodhurst, dec'd," sued a Capt. Lefebur for "accommodation," which was "for four months' house roome and dyett of his family." Judgment in favor of "Mrs. Ann Brodhurst," which was

only the half measure of her then identity, but may have then been the legal way.

From now on till he died 17 years later, John Washington, being a man of affairs, was constantly employed in duties as a county justice, a coroner (in August, 1661, when coroner, he and his jury reported to the County Court on their burial of a suicide, saying they had obeyed the Law, and had buried him at a certain spot, "with a stake driven through ye middle of him in his grave"), a burgess and a member of the General Assembly, and commander of the county militia, having been commissioned Lt. Col. 29 Mar., 1673; on 17 Mar., 1674-5, he had been on a commission to employ Indians, and reward them for work, but on 31 August, 1675, this scheme to pacify the savages having failed, he was ordered to organize an expedition against the Indians, and set out to drive them out of the sea-board, and his activity was one of the causes for Bacon's Rebellion, which Col. Washington was active in helping to put down, and it was suppressed early in the Spring of 1677.

You have seen that Col. Washington dated his will on 21 Sep., 1675, and named his then wife as a co-executor. In a general way it could be said "he provided for his wife handsomely," should she survive him. She did survive him, as will be shown. His was but a perfunctory will, so far as she was concerned; a rather cold one. Beside the "widow's third," her dower right in his real estate, which the law guaranteed a wife, and a one-fourth share in his personal estate, he made no mention where, nor how, she should live, which a testator of his time always did for his wife, nor did he mention her in any endearing term as was also the custom. His brother Lawrence, who made his will almost at the same time, was more generous and considerate for his second wife.

By his second wife, Col. Washington seems to have

had several children, possibly four, according to wills. Two evidently died before he wrote his will, as he says two were buried in the Washington graveyard. And his son Lawrence says he has "brothers and sisters" buried in the same ground, and John, Jr., his brother, also says "brothers" buried there. Apparently they died young and unmarried.

Col. Washington we have seen married as first and second wives, two widows, each a "Mrs. Ann B.," and each had a son. Now, you will find that he married, thirdly, while his second wife was living, another widow, and that he was her fourth husband. She, too, survived Col. John, and was his joint-widow and co-relict with his alleged second wife, Ann Pope.

The evidence that Col. Washington did have a third wife, while Ann Pope was alive, may be found in the Westmoreland Co. Court Order Book of the date. This is the customary "Marriage Contract," dated 10 May, 1676, "of Lt. Col. John Washington and Mrs. Frances Appleton, the widow and relict of Captain John Appleton." All of this county.

As the proof that this contract was carried out, there is the following item, also from this Order Book, under date, 26 November, 1677.

"It is ord'r yt Jno Garrard have out of ye Estate of Cap't Jno Appleton, deceas'd, now ye estate of Coll. Jno. Washington, who intermarried with ye Relict of ye sd Appleton, tenn goode breeding cows," &c.

The petitioner and beneficiary under this Court Order was the eldest brother of the lady whom Col. Washington had married the year before, and he surely knew they had married. He had served under Lt. Col. Washington, in the expedition against the Indians, in the Autumn of 1675. He was present at the Court of Inquiry as to the particulars of it, and on 14 June, 1677, testified as to the conduct of his commander, Washington, present in Court, and exonerated him and the Vir-

ginia troops he commanded, from the charge of participating in the execution of Indians when attending a conference with the commanders of the troops.

Col. Washington apparently raised no objection to this order of the Court. Nor did he alter his will, after he married, between its date and filing, Mrs. Frances (Garrard) Speke-Peyton-Appleton, and became her fourth husband.

Col. Washington and Widow Appleton were old friends and neighbors, and he had known all of her husbands intimately, having long served in the same regiment with them. He became her attorney after the death of Captain Appleton, who, was high sheriff of Westmoreland, 1673-4, and was a subscribing witness to Washington's will, but died before 9 May, 1676, when the inventory of his personal estate was filed by his widow. As the latter's attorney, he is of record of having been in Court several times on her behalf.

It is evident that the Widow Appleton was clear and free to marry, in May, 1676. But how about Col. Washington? His second wife, Widow Brodhurst, certainly has to be reckoned with. She must be allowed an exit, for I do not wish to asperse his character, nor hers. He was a gentleman, that must be remembered, and Mrs. Appleton there is no reason to suppose was not his equal. Both seemed rather fond of marrying, and we must admit that the Colonel was no "laggard in love," but he must have been sensible along with this habit, and would scorn to take the risk of a bigamist. Still the query:—How can a man with a wife (his own, of course), marry another woman? The Colonel certainly had a wife of his own, in Sept., 1675, who outlived him, but in the following May, he married another lady, and polygamy had ceased for ages to be fashionable, and was not revived till a couple of centuries later, therefore, how did he get rid of her?

That Mrs. Ann (Pope) Washington, formerly Mrs.

Walter Brodhurst, was alive after Sept., 1675, and survived Col. John Washington, who died before 10 Jan., 1677-8, and after 14 June, 1677, may be seen thru the following items:

Whether it was before, or after, May, 1676, or before, or after, Col. Washington died, and it matters little here when it was, Mrs. Ann (Pope) Brodhurst-Washington went to England to visit her son, Walter Brodhurst, Jr., and her Brodhurst kin residing at Lilleshall, in Salop. And, as it is learned from an English Court record, she hoped to collect a legacy, due her over twenty years from the estate of her Brodhurst father-in-law.

Before sailing, or after reaching England, it matters little which, she executed a power of attorney, dated 18 March, 1677-8, and signed it "Ann Washington," and in which she is described "the widow and relict of Captain John Washington," and qualified Mr. Caleb Butler, a Westmoreland Co. Justice, to collect and remit to her certain debts due her in Maryland and Virginia. This document was filed in this County Court, on 30 March, 1678. As there are only twelve days between the date of writing and of filing this "Power," and considering the time it required then for a ship to cross from England to Virginia, the paper was signed in Virginia, hence, Ann Pope Brodhurst-Washington went to England after, or on the 17 March, 1677-8, which was, of course, after Col. Washington was buried by the side of his first wife, the mother of Lawrence, John, Jr., and Ann.

Ann Pope's description of herself in this paper was rather impertinent; however, we are thankful for the preserving of it, because it tells us that Col. Washington's second wife was alive when he married his third wife, and that Ann Pope survived him.

And, since there is no item yet found showing that Ann had been in England between Sept., 1675, and

March, 1678, this paper also shows that she was divorced from John by a Virginia County Court, or by the General Court. Which of them instituted the suit would be interesting to know, but no one has come across such an item. The action would have been in their home-county, and the Westmoreland Court Order Books, or daily minutes of the proceedings of the courts in session, are perfect and complete, as are also those of the General Courts of these days, as Bacon's Rebellion had ended. Therefore, where's the evidence that John and Ann were divorced?

There is evidence that Washington was a busy man, sometimes in the Assembly, and again in the field with his troops, even up to his third wedding-day, but we know that a great many things can and do happen in eight months, so it may have been in this time, between when Col. John signed his will and then went on his expedition against the Indians, and the filing of the marriage contract, that it was Ann who got busy with the divorce court, and the Colonel made no defense. However, whilst this could have happened, there is no proof that it did. It does not seem possible that the divorce was granted, or even arranged before John wrote his will, because of its contexture. Howsoever, whatsoever, it happened, and Col. Washington was free to marry, and did so about May, 1676, and, as you may have noticed, in no clandestine manner either, because his intention to marry the Widow Appleton was spread upon the Court minutes that anyone might read. And there was his marriage license, too.

No one thinks that Ann Pope, who had been living seventeen years with John Washington, minding her step-children and her own, and possibly being homely in disposition, would not have protested, to put it mildly, in this month of May, 1676, if she did not know that Col. John was free to do as it pleased him when it came to marrying even a thrice relict and widow.

Judging from the arrangement Ann Pope made in March, 1678, about her personal affairs in the colonies, it looks as if she did not intend returning to America. And there was no particular reason why she should delay her departure, or return. Her use as an executor of Washington's will had automatically ceased, when Lawrence entered upon his inheritance, and with him, only a step-son, as the head of the House of Washington in Virginia, as his father's heir. And, too, she had been relieved by him of the "care of bringing up" of his sister Ann, and the bringing up of John, Jr., had been entrusted to her brother, Thomas Pope. But more than anything, she may have realized that she was not a *persona grata* amid the Washingtons and neighbors. Therefore, she went to England.

She died shortly after she reached her destination. The exact date of this event I do not know. Nor do I know when she landed, but of course, it was after 18 March 1677-8.

She was buried, probably at Lilleshall parish church, certainly before 12 April, 1678, because on this date, her son, Walter Brodhurst, Jr., of Lilleshall, Shropshire, was appointed by the Litchfield Diocesan Court, which had jurisdiction over wills, estates, orphans, &c., in the Archdeaconery of Salop, to administer on the personal estate of "his mother, Misstress Ann Washington *alias* Brodhurst, (*sic*), of Washington parish, Westmoreland County, Virginia."

If Ann Pope was divorced from Col. Washington, and there are reasons to hope she was, it was more likely to have been after Washington signed his will than before. The cause of it, of course, I do not know, but, for a conjecture, it may have been because of the will. But what we are also interested in is the suggestion all thru it that John had really married Ann Pope, and he knew, if she survived him she would be his widow and

relict before the law, for, wherever he gave land to a child he excepted Ann's dower right.

When the Bacon uprising got afoot, Col. Washington hired a sloop and sent his cattle, horses, &c., into Maryland to save them from raiders. When the rebel commander learned this he issued a warrant dated 21 Oct., 1676, ordering one of his officers, one Mannering, to go to Washington's plantations and prevent their removal, or "to cease ye sloop yt shall in anytime attempt yt takeing of goods belonging to sd Washington or any other delinquent yt are fled fayle not hereof." Subsequently, Mannering, was captured and parolled on giving bond dated 19 June, 1677. Before a commission investigating the conduct of many of those who had been rebels, a Mr. Arminger made an affidavit, dated 26 July, 1677, telling of Mannering's visit in Oct., 1676, to Col. Washington's house, and said "Madam Washington sd to ye sd Mannering, 'if you were advised by your wife, you need not acome to this passe' "; that is, being in disgrace. As this visit occurred in Oct., 1677, it was Mrs. Frances Washington speaking.

Simply because the usual records of the lawful marriage of Col. John Washington and Ann Pope Brodhurst, and the decree of their divorce cannot be found, it would not be fair to assume, or presume she had not legally married John (early in 1659), when I have cited contemporary items suggesting, if not actually proving, she had. And it would be unfair to both John and Ann to doubt they were legally separated (between Sep., 1675, and May., 1676), for John's third marriage was no secret, as contemporary items cited show. Therefore, it may be assumed that John Washington was not a bigamist. The ancient "Scotch verdict" is more appropriate to the question of John's marriage (and divorce) with Ann Pope, than to this conclusion.

III.

THE LEGITIMATION OF COL. JOHN WASHINGTON.

When Mr. Waters discovered the evidence proving that Col. John Washington, of Virginia, was "the eldest son of the Rev. Lawrence Washington, A.M., (Oxon)," sometime the rector of the Purleigh parish church, Essex, England, it was the consensus of genealogists he had accomplished something worthwhile.

But when Mr. Stanard subsequently discovered the evidence proving that Col. John Washington was born in the year 1629, he started a lot of genealogical trouble because his find either made a mare's nest of Mr. Waters' discovery, or that Col. Washington was born out of wedlock, thus placing him in the illegitimate class.

The following are the facts as to both of these statements. My intention is to try to legitimate Col. Washington, and you will see what is required to do so. Contemporary circumstantial evidence, based on incidents, or presumptive evidence, in this case would not be sufficient, being secondary, to overcome the demonstrative internal evidence. There must be material evidence and proof that the Rev. Mr. Washington married before his eldest son and first child was born.

The will of a Mr. Andrew Knowling was found by Mr. Waters and printed in his valuable book, "Gleanings in English Wills," pp. 364 and 386, of vol. I. it is dated at Tring, in Hertfordshire, 13 Jan., 1648-9, and signed with his "mark." He had considerable property, and had married the widow of John Roades, the mother of children by her first husband.

It was through the finding of Mr. Knowling's will, that Mr. Waters claimed he was enabled to bring to a positive conclusion, in 1889, the search for the parents of Col. John Washington, which quest had been going on intermittingly since in 1791, and then identified Col.

John's father in the family of Washington of Sulgrave, therefore, what I say of Col. John's pedigree is on Waters' information.

In his will, Knowling mentioned relatives of his wife, and her children, his step-children. Among the latter was "Mrs. Amphillis Washington," who had six children, also named by Knowling. But while he named many persons, he did not mention the name of Amphillis' husband, nor mention him in any way, which seems rather strange. However, one may imagine a lot of reasons, and in a case of this kind, one guess may be as good as another, and mine is, Knowling was a Cromwellian, and Mr. Washington was a rabid Royalist, and the Civil War was at its worst then, and the king was executed only seventeen days after Knowling made his will.

The names of the six Washington children as given by Knowling, were so suggestive of the Virginia Washingtons, that it started Waters on his quest for their father's name is interestingly told by him.

By the address of Knowling's will, he was first attracted to Tring. Here he found two of these children were baptised at the parish church as the children of "Mr. Lawrence Washington." He decided, as this father was styled "Mr.," he was a minister. Eventually, as he found that a "Rev. Lawrence Washington" had been employed at the Church Court at Wheathampstead, near Tring, at the time Knowling made his will, and later, he felt sure he had found the husband of Amphillis, and the father of her children, which idea was strengthened by the fact that one of them was designated in the will as "Lawrence Washington the younger," as though to distinguish him from his father of the same name, the others being named in it as John, William, Elizabeth, Margaret and Martha Washington.

From the records of the University of Oxford and one of its colleges, Brasenose, it was easy to get infor-

mation as to the early life, some of it anyway, of the Rev. Lawrence Washington, which is proper to repeat in this article. He was born in 1602, at Brington Manor, Northamptonshire, and entered Brasenose College as a student, when 17 years of age, but did not sign as such till 2 Nov., 1621. He graduated and received the A.B. degree 10 May, 1623, and on 27 May, 1623, he was elected to the Darbie Fellowship in Brasenose, and became a Fellow for ten years of this college, from which he received the A. M. degree, 1 Feb., 1625-6. In the following year he was appointed his college lector, and on August 26, 1631, he was elected the proctor of the University of Oxford.

On 10 March, 1632-3, "his grace for the B.D. degree was passed on," and on 4 April, 1633, "he informed Brasenose College that he was to be inducted in a benefice." And, on 30 Nov., 1633, he resigned his Fellowship in Brasenose College, having previously resigned as the University proctor.

The Rev. Mr. Washington, on 14 March, 1633-4, entered upon his duties as the rector of the church of the parish of Purleigh, in the deanery of Malden, Co. of Essex. Thus, Mr. Washington was removed to the most easterly of the tier of adjoining counties, Oxford, Bucks, Herts and Essex, with which you shall see he was associated.

What was the influence Mr. Washington had to have this living, a fairly good one, given to him by Jane Horsmanden, of Purleigh, is not in evidence. Nor is the reason, when he entered into it, why he did not take his wife and family with him to the rectory, than to place them nearly a two days' horseback journey away from him in the village of Tring, in Herts. May be she preferred it; her mother and step-father having resided there, and some relatives were still there. Mr. Washington, too, must have been acquainted with the place, and this may have been the residence of

Amphillis since the birth of her first child. Mr. Washington's acquaintance with the place may be accounted for this way. A distant relative by marriage, of his father, Sir Robert Anderson, Knt., resided in a manor house near Tring, which he bought from Sir Francis Verney, in 1607, and Lawrence may have visited him when a college student, as Sir Robert, who was buried at the Tring church, in 1632, in his will, dated 5 Oct., 1630, remembered him with a legacy: "to my cousin, Lawrence Washington, of Bras Nose College, forty shillings," which was a generous gift, since it was only Sir Robert's wife who was a cousin of Lawrence's father, and it suggests he knew Lawrence well.

There is little information about Mr. Washington after he became the rector of Purleigh till his last year. There was a case in the Chancery Court, under date of 20 Oct., 1640, which shows that an Oxford store-keeper had entered suit, away back in July, 1633, against "Mr. Lawrence Washington, clerk, of Purleigh," for £69.18, balance due for furniture and clothing sold to him "when a student at Braz Nose College." Washington's defence was that he had paid the man all he had owed him in installments, in May, 1633, and May, 1636. Our particular interest in this case, rather an interesting one, but too intricate to go into here, is the title description of the defendant, because it clearly identifies the Purleigh rector with the student and Fellow of Brasenose, for there is no record of any other Lawrence Washington having attended any college of Oxford University, 1619-1634.

In Nov., 1643, the Rev. Mr. Washington was ejected from his charge, the parish church of Purleigh. This happened during the Civil War, and was one of Cromwell's measures for silencing "Rabid Royalists." This was the primal objection or charge as to our minister, but it was printed that he was "a drunkard and tavern loafer," and not fit to have charge of a parish,

however, the Rev. Washington had plenty of company under such charges. What Mr. Washington did after this to support himself and his alleged (by Mr. Waters) family, a wife and six children, does not appear.

Along in 1649, it may be imagined that his wife was in need of some assistance, as on 15 August, 1649, the Committee on aid to "Plundered Ministers," victims of Cromwell, ordered the then rector of Purleigh parish, Washington's old charge, "to pay one-fifth of the tithes "to Mrs. Washington, the [former] rector's wife."

Early in 1648-9, Mr. Washington is found employed as the surrogate in the office at Wheathampstead, Herts, of the Archdeacon's Court. And as surrogate, 29 Jan., 1648-9, he wrote the bond of the guardians of two orphans, his alleged wife's nieces, daughters of a tallow chandler, legatees in the 1649 will of Mr. Knowling, and signed it with his full name, and also his Oxford degrees, and then official position. This was the only connection "the Rev. Lawrence Washington, clerk," had with the will of his alleged (Waters) wife's step-father.

When the commission aided "Mrs. Washington," it is possible it also did something for the former rector. A salaried position may have been found for him in or near Malden, Essex, as "he died and was buried here at All Saints' Church," its register entry being:—"Mr. Lawrence Washington, buried 21 Jan., 1652." It was too far away for him to be buried at Tring. No particulars of his death are known.

As evidence that the Rev. Lawrence Washington, 1602-1652, A.M., B.D., (Oxon), of Tring and Purleigh, was a son, the fourth, of Lawrence Washington, Esq., lord of Brixton, or Brington manor, Northamptonshire, and his wife, Margaret Butler, married at Aston le Wells, 3 August, 1580, I shall use a few of the interesting wills collected by Mr. Waters, for his book. q. v.

But first we have the record of Lawrence, Jr.'s matriculation at Brasenose College, 2 Nov., 1621:—"Laurent Washington, Northamp., gen. fil., an. nat. 19." Which is, he was 19 years old, and the son of a gentleman of Northants.

Then next, we find this item connecting him definitely with the Washingtons of Brington:—Robert Washington, brother to the lord of Brington, (died in 1616), was buried at Brington, 10 March, 1621–2. His widow, Elizabeth Washington, died 19 March, 1622–3, leaving a will, dated 17 March, 1622–3, in which she named many legatees, principally her late husband's nephew and nieces, called "cousins," the children of his deceased brother Lawrence, among them Sir William, Mrs. Mewce, Alice and Frances Washington, "my cousin Pill," and "To my cousin, Lawrence Washington, who is nowe at Oxford, my husband's seal ringe."

The will of the above mentioned Mrs. Elizabeth Mewce, widow, residing in County Middlesex, near London, dated 11 Aug., 1676, of her legatees are her sisters:—Lady Washington, Mrs. Alice Sandys, and Mrs. Frances Gargrave, and her husband, Mr. Robert Gargrave, and their five children; her uncles, Mr. Robert Washington, brother of Mr. Washington, of Brington, and Mr. Francis Pargiter, father-in-law of Sir John Washington; her nephews, William Pill and Roger Thornton; and her nieces, Mrs. Margaret Stevenage, and two children; Mrs. Frances Collins, Mrs. Elizabeth Rumball, and Mrs. Penelope Thornton, and five children.

The will of Lady Dorothy (Pargiter) Washington, widow of Sir. John Washington (a son of Mr. Lawrence Washington, of Brington), dated 6 Oct., 1678, mentions Mrs. Penelope Thornton aforesaid, as her daughter, and this assures us that Mrs. Mewce was a daughter of the lord of Brington manor, Northants.

No brother or sister of Lawrence Washington in their extant wills mentions him after he became a clergyman, or his wife and children. It was a large family, some children died young, some unmarried, some adults died intestate. Those who left wills were well off, and may not have felt any interest in the struggling minister, who, himself, seems to have been a rather independent character, even when a student, of the classics or of theology, and certainly when ejected.

This brings me up to an interesting time of the Rev. Lawrence Washington's early life, while a student, especially as to when, where, or how he made the acquaintance of "Amphillis Roades, or Roads; the mother of his children." But as to when and where they were married, I am sorry I can only say that to be able to answer this question, the most expert of genealogical searchers, most persistent men and women, plodders in old records, for years, have looked, and looked, and looked in vain, to find even some slight clew, or item, relative to it. Yet some day, such an item may turn up. Many have in the years many of these same genealogists have been dead, that have given a new twist to their statements and deductions, especially in the "Washington Genealogy." "WATCH YOUR STEP," is a well-known sign everywhere. "Watch your genealogical 'step'," should be a good one to hang before him and her on their desks when writing Family History.

In 1620, Sir Edward Verney (he and Thomas Washington, a brother of the Rev. Lawrence, served together in the household of Prince Charles), brother to Sir Francis mentioned before, purchased the large manor of Middle Claydon, in Co. Bucks, which was near to the University of Oxford, in the next county, and died in 1643, leaving a will, dated 26 March, 1639. Among his sundry legatees he gave "to my servant, John Roades, at Middle Claydon, an annuity of ten pounds for life."

John Roades was above an ordinary "servant," yet

he was such. He was evidently the head-farmer, or the superintendent of the manor, because he is of record as being Sir Edward's bailiff, or deputy sheriff, in 1639. His son, William Roades, was a witness to Sir Edward's will, and succeeded his father as chief farmer of this manor, before 1648, as Andrew Knowling, afore-said, had married his mother, widow of the said John Roades, before Jan., 1649, when Knowling made his will, and made William, his step-son, and brother of Mrs. Amphyllis Washington, his step-daughter, legatees, therefore, William was uncle to Col. John Washington, and John Roades was one of his grandfathers, his other being, of course, the prominent Lawrence Washington, Esq., the lord of the manor of Brixton, or Brington. William Roades made his will 19 Sep., 1657, and was buried on the 29th, at Finmoor Hill, about 2 miles from Middle Claydon), but did not mention his sister, Amphyllis Washington, nor her husband, nor their issue. In fact, neither did Amphyllis' sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Fitzherbert, in her will, dated 23 Feb., 1684, (her step-nephew, John Freeman, was her executor, having married at Luton, 4 April, 1668, Esther, a daughter of Amphyllis' brother, William Roads), but which is not surprising, because this Washington family was nearly all dead.

When Lawrence Washington was an Oxford student, the son and heir of this Sir Edward Verney was also. It is quite possible they were well enough acquainted for young Verney to take Washington home with him on holidays, or week-ends (anyway, Lawrence's elder brother, Thomas, had been a page with Sir Edward in the household of Prince Charles, while in Spain, in 1623, and Lawrence was not a stranger), and when at Middle Claydon he met Amphyllis Roades, the farmer's daughter, in some natural way that young people have, and we may imagine what happened next, as we know the sequel. [Sir Edward had a younger son, of whom

it is related in "Virginia Carolorum," pp. 108-111, that he "married beneath him," and as punishment, his parents shipped him to the Virginia colony].

This romantic affair at Middle Claydon certainly happened before the year 1629, as it was in this year, or in 1628-9, or in 1629-30, Amphilis gave birth to her first child, who was named John, whom you have seen became our Virginia Colonel (who had some romances of his own), who was about five years old when his father became rector of Purleigh.

As evidence of the date of Col. John Washington's birth-date, there is the following Court item. Some years ago (but years after the "true Washington pedigree," authenticated, signed and printed, in sundry ways), Mr. Stanard, editor of the Va. Mag. of His., discovered and printed this good newsy item: "In a deposition dated 1674, and recorded in the Westmoreland County Court Order Book, Col. John Washington stated he was then forty-five (45) years of age."

This is not exactly all the facts connected with this important item. The affidavit was a part of the court proceedings when the will of a Richard Cole was presented in Court for probate. Washington's deposition, beginning:—"Col. John Washington, aged 45 years, or thereabouts, declared," &c.

This deposition is undated, but it could be no later than the date of the item that follows it; but as it is recorded between two items both dated, that is, next after one dated "5 Jan'y, 1675", (1674-5), and followed by one dated "12 Feb'y, 1674-5," it may be presumed that John was then aged 44-45, or 45-46, and born in 1628-29, or in 1629-30, or, as a compromise, in 1629.

Richard, or "Dick" Cole, at the proving of whose will Washington testified, was a queer character (see W. M. Quart., IV, p. 30). His abusive tongue spared few of his acquaintances. Of John Washington, it is reported he said: "He's an ass, negro-driver," whom he would

have up before the governor and council, "as a Companie of Caterpillar fellowes," who "live upon my bills of export," or foreign exchange.

But not everyone was glad to know what this item told. For one, Dr. Tyler, the editor of the *W. and M. Quar.*, who asked the appropriate question:—"As John Washington was born in 1629, what becomes of the Washington Pedigree, saying that John was the son of the Rev. Lawrence Washington, who was the proctor of Oxford University, in 1631, presumably unmarried then."

The approximation of the birth-date of Col. Washington is a more serious discovery than a gratifying one, for it opens up controversy over an unpleasant question. But it is only one of the peculiar situations that turn up in genealogy once in a while to puzzle its writers, for a genealogist's work is not one of all thrills; he is often up against ugly propositions which have to be handled with consideration.

Dr. Tyler, as above said, only thought that John's 1629 birth-date ruined Mr. Waters' claim to have discovered John's parentage and his long line of paternal ancestry, this, because the Rev. Lawrence Washington, 1602-1652, could not have been the proctor of the University of Oxford and also have a wife, which was contrary to University rules, at the time, seeing that John was born while his alleged father was the proctor.

In order to have authoritative information upon this alleged University rule, and an opinion on the speculation which was started by the acquaintance with it, a vital one to Col. John's pedigree, but more so to the morality of his parents, I stated the case to one of the Oxford Uni. officials, who should be familiar with its laws and customs, ancient as well as modern.

He replied confirming in the main Dr. Tyler's statement, by giving a different version as proof, saying: "Mr. Lawrence Washington, on 27 May, 1623, was

elected to a Darbie Fellowship at Brasenose, and, as a Fellow, he would necessarily be unmarried." "He resigned his Fellowship on 30 Nov., 1633." "The Proctorship is a University office; not a College office. Lawrence Washington was elected the proctor of the University on 26 August, 1631, he being at that time a Fellow of Brasenose College," [and "necessarily" a bachelor, of course.]

We have from this first-hand information, Lawrence Washington, being, so far as the college was aware, an unmarried man in the ten years he was a privileged student at Brasenose, he being a Fellow, was the father of a child born before 30 Nov., 1633, when he resigned from the Fellowship, and before 23 June, 1635, when his apparently second child was baptised Lawrence.

Therefore, it may be assumed this Brasenose Fellow married clandestinely the farmer's daughter, and had a child by her while she resided at I know not where, while he passed himself off in college as a bachelor, and pursued his theological studies, and prepared himself for the ministry, on the principle, "Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth."

Lawrence certainly married out of his social class, which was no crime, nor even a novelty in his class, yet it was not a match that would please his aristocratic family, which was allied to many families holding prominent positions in the social world. It may have been because of this mesalliance that Lawrence seems to have been "dropped" by his family. But I have no excuse for the Roades people ignoring him.

Of the six children of Lawrence and Amphilis Washington (for she was twice styled "Mrs. Washington" in 1649, as above):

1. John Washington, born "*circa* 1629," as above. He went to Virginia, probably after his father's death, in 1652, as he was apparently a Captain of Northumber-

land Co. militia, before he was commissioned Major in the Westmoreland regiment, 4 April, 1655, and, in spite of higher ranks attached, was sometimes called Captain, and even so by his second wife, after his death, in her document of 1678. It used to be thought that he was the John who was at Bermuda in 1654, as stated in the will of Theodore Pargiter, but as Pargiter calls him "cousin John Washington in Bermuda," it seems more reasonable to place him as Sir John's second son John, since his mother, mentioned above, was Theodore's sister.

Another reason why it may be presumed with confidence that John Washington came to Virginia to reside, possibly earlier than 1652, or when he was 21, is suggested by the following: Whenever he came, he settled in the thriving county of Northumberland, a large county (which included the site of Washington city), and in that part of it from which the new county of Westmoreland was formed by an Act of Assembly in 1652-3, and was represented by two Burgesses in the Assembly of 1654. By another Act, 1654-5, it was ordered that original parishes should be relayed, surveyed and renamed. The old parish in which Captain Washington had his residence was renamed in his honor Washington parish, which surely should be almost convincing that John Washington had lived here years, and was not only a popular citizen, but a man, tho young, noted as a leader in public affairs.

2. Lawrence Washington, "the younger," as called in Mr. Knowling's will. He was their first child of record in the Tring parish register:—"Christened, on Our Lady's Day, 1635, Layaranc sonn of Layrance Washington." He was named as the residuary legatee of his estate by Mr. Knowling, his mother's step-father, in his will, 1649, he being Mr. Knowling's god-son. It has been thought that he was sometime a merchant at Luton, in Bedfordshire, before his removal to Virginia,

where he certainly was in May, 1659, as he was one of the subscribing witnesses, with his brother John, to the will of Col. Pope, at this date.

There was a Lawrence Washington, a merchant, at Luton, with whom Virginians had some dealings, and he could have been the son of Amphillis, the merchant being identified otherwise, but there is no positive evidence connecting Amphillis' son, Lawrence, with Luton as a merchant such as there is which identifies this son, and his brother, John, with her. There is evidence that he returned shortly to England and went to Luton, where he married at the parish church, 26 Jan., 1660, his first wife, Mary, daughter of Edmund Jones, of Luton, and brought her to Virginia, several years later, (some accounts say in 1667), and after the baptism of their child, recorded at the parish church, Luton, "Mary Washington, daughter of Mr. Lawrence and Mary," 22 Dec., 1663. Mary is mentioned in the wills of her grandfather Jones, 8 March, 1682, and her father, 1675.

Apparently, aside from these items connecting him with Luton, it is presumed he was influenced to settle there by the following two original, or further, reasons, (1), his mother's sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Fitzherbert, of Much Maltham, Essex, had acquaintance and interests in Luton, and (2), his cousin, Mrs. Esther Freeman, his uncle William Roades' daughter, resided at Luton.

Lawrence's earliest grant of Virginia land of record, is for 700 acres (in Stafford Co.), dated 27 Sep., 1667; his brother John was granted 5000 acres, same date and locality. Lawrence became a planter, died in Virginia, a few days before his brother John died, leaving a will and issue by two wives.

3. Elizabeth Washington. She was baptised at the Tring church, 17 August, 1636, and entered on the register as "daughter of Mr. Layarance Washington." [This is the only instance found (unless the "Mr. Law-

rence Washington," buried at Malden, Essex, in 1652, is proved to have been the husband of Amphillis, which has not been done yet, is another), where Amphillis' husband is styled "Mr."]. She is named in the will, 1697, of Mrs. Martha Hayward, of Virginia, as "my eldest sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Rumbold, in England."

It is not known when or where she married, nor has the name of her husband been found. It may be she did not marry in London, as her sister Margaret did, as she is not in the printed London marriage license lists. It is quite possible that her husband may have been a Hertfordshire man, because there were in her day, and from early times, Rumbold families in Herts. However, families of Rumbold, Rumbould, Rumboldz, Rambold, Rombolde, &c., are of record in Elizabeth's time in many English shires. Nothing further of her is known.

For a good reason, as will appear below, it is proper to notice here some of the Rumbold families in Herts. In 1316, a Nicholas Rumbaude, served on a jury at an Inq. P. M., and 1437, a James Rumbolde served in this county on the same kind of a jury. In 1567, a John Rumbold bought a farm in North Mimms parish from the Crown, and in 1606, John and Robert Rumbold were tenants of Clothall manor, and in 1670, there was a Rumbold family living in Walkhorne parish, and so on.

A member of a Rumbold family of Herts, long residing at the purchased manor of Woodhall, was created a baronet. An early member of his family, William Rumbold, was "controller of the great wardrobe," to Charles I., and surveyor-general of all the customs of England. Another Hertfordshire Rumbold worthy was that Colonel Richard Rumbold, born in 1622, who resided at "Rye House," a farm in Stanstead-Abbot parish, this county. He was one of the gentlemen who was captured after much trouble in finding him, tried

and executed, after being found guilty of high treason, in 1683, for conspiring to murder King Charles II., and his brother James. His home, where he assembled his fellow conspirators, gave name to this historic plot. His son, Thomas Rumbold, *Generosus*" (the keeper of the Rose Tavern, at Cambridge), was buried at Royston parish church, Herts.

4. Margaret Washington. There is no record of her baptism at the Tring parish church, but she was born in or about 1638-9, as learned from her marriage license, from which we also learn she was living in the parish of St. Giles-in-the-Field, Middlesex county, near London, when she married.

The printed abstract of her marriage license runs:—Margaret Washington, age 24 years, of St. Giles in the Field, Middlesex, and George Talbott, of the same, bachelor, gent., age 26 years. To be married at the same parish. Nothing further is known of her, excepting she is mentioned in the will of Mrs. Martha Hayward, as "my other sister, Mrs. Margaret Talbut," in England, (1697).

5. William Washington. He was baptised at the Tring church, 14 Oct., 1641. His father's name was not recorded. This is all that is known of him. He may have died young and unmarried, tho not again mentioned in the church register, beginning in 1584.

A careless blunder is made in Burke's "Visitations of Seats and Arms," in England (1852), in saying that Sir William Washington, of Packington manor, was this William, and "brother to John and Lawrence Washington, the Virginia immigrants." He was the brother of Sir John, the Rev. Lawrence, Mrs. Mewce, et al.

6. Martha Washington. Her birth and baptism not of Tring parish church record. From her statements in her will, 1697, she was apparently the youngest daughter and last child of Lawrence and Amphillis.

Col. John Washington, of Virginia, mentions her particularly in his will, 1675, saying:—"To my sister, Martha Washington, ten pounds out of the money I have in England, and whatever she should be owing to me for transporting herself into this country, and a year's accommodation after coming, and 4000 pounds of tobacco and cask." She came to Virginia and married a Mr. Hayward, and died here, leaving a will, written in Stafford Co., Va., 6 May, 1697, and proved 28 Dec. following. This will was found by Mr. Ford among papers at the Federal Dept. of State, and, as stated below, was of great value to Mr. Waters, in completing his Washington pedigree.

After giving legacies to a number of Virginia cousins, she enjoined her executors "with all convenient speed send to England to my eldest sister, Mrs. Elizabeth Rumbold, a Tunne of good weight Tobacco." [This commodity at that time was equivalent to our money, and was the only "cash" the colony had in circulation.] She also instructed that her executors:—"Doe likewise take freight and for England to my other sister, Mrs. Margaret Talbut, a Tunne of good weight of Tobacco."

An extant letter of John Washington (a son of Lawrence, the immigrant), dated Virginia, 22 June, 1699, to his half-sister, Mrs. Mary Gibson, of Hawnes, Bedfordshire (her father had given her all of his estate in England, by his will), mentions a letter from her to "my aunt Howard," as the surname Hayward was pronounced in Virginia.

By this, to me, accurate arrangement of the succession of the recorded issue of Lawrence and Amphillis Washington, it seems that the hiatus between the birth dates of their first child, John, "born in 1629," and Lawrence, their first child of church record, born in 1635, appears somewhat irregular (but then "you can never tell!") The unexpected happens as regularly as

the expected), compared with the records of the rest of the brood.

Mrs. Amphillis (Roades) Washington, died at home, in the village of Tring, and was buried at Tring parish church, 16 Jan., 1654-5, according to the church record, and it is possible that all of her children were at the funeral.

On 8 Feb., 1654-5, about a month after the funeral, letters of administration on the personal estate of Mrs. Washington, by the Archdeacon's Court, at Wheat-hampstead, Herts, "to John Washington, the eldest lawful and natural son of Amphillis Washington, late of Tring, dec'd." "He being first sworn, deposed," &c. This valuable item settles three things. Amphillis' son John was then of full age, 21 years, as was necessary, so that he could qualify as administrator. That he was present in person in this Diocesan Court, on this date, 8 Feb., 1654-5, and that he must have returned shortly to Virginia, to personally receive his commission, on 4 April, 1655, promoting him from a captain to a major of the Westmoreland regiment, at the time that Thomas Speke (the first husband of Washington's third wife), was appointed its colonel, and Nathaniel Pope (Washington's second father-in-law), its lieut. col. The appointment of John Washington to be the major of the first regiment organized in this new county, shows he had been well established in the county of Northumberland, from which it was formed, for several years at least, and was a man of affairs, and popular in the county, where shortly the parish in which he resided was given his surname. It was not remarkable that he should have been in England when his mother died, it was only a coincidence, and this was his first trading voyage abroad, under Col. Pope, a business he followed on his own account for many years after this, and in this way, "came to Virginia" in several different years.

You have seen that Lawrence Washington, A. B., 1623, A. M., 1626, remained at the University as a theological student, preparing for the ministry, and received the B. D. degree, 10 March, 1632-3. And that from 27 May, 1623, when he was elected, till 30 Nov., 1633, when he resigned it, he was a Fellow of Brasenose College, and "necessarily unmarried." The college Fellowships of Lawrence's time, were still governed by feudal and monkish requirements and regulations, which had been enforced ever since there were colleges and fellowships in Great Britain and the continent. These ancient fellowships, regulations and customs were unchanged at Oxford University till in 1852, when they were revised and modified to conform more with modern customs and comforts.

Under the olden time Fellowship rules, to be elected a Fellow, the candidate had to be a graduate of the college that controlled the Fellowship he desired to join, and agree to continue to be a student in some special course. The advantages it would give a Fellow over ordinary students and the undergraduates were many, because he had more privileges. Another important feature was he was a co-partner in the Fellowship fund, and even in the college revenue, which was a great help to a poor student. Such advantages made them the aristocrats of the college world. Tho freer in his movements, he still had to conform with the fundamental college laws, as well as those of his Fellowship. The one law, passed on for centuries, that particularly interests us, is the one that a college student, an undergraduate or a post-graduate, must be and remain a bachelor while connected with the University and his college. Naturally, this was the *sine qua non* of the Fellowships, for the Fellow was only a higher grade college student, therefore, a Fellow was "necessarily unmarried." And one other rule was, should a Fellow while pursuing his studies, and enjoying the Fellow-

ship, receive a salarièd position, he must resign from his Fellowship, and should a Fellow marry, he also must resign. Since the ancient laws have been made more liberal, students may marry, and a married man can become, by special permission, members of a Fellowship, also Fellows may marry, if they get the permission, but not otherwise. A married Fellow, at Cambridge, is called a Fellow Commoner, and at Oxford, a Gentleman Commoner. These married Fellows are obliged to pay extra "to common," that is to dine with the regular Fellows at their table, the latter being known as the Dons of the college, while the married students who are Fellows, are Demi Dons.

Lawrence Washington we know was a Fellow. Was he married while a Fellow? When he got a salarièd position he resigned from the Fellowship, for he could not hide that fact. We have seen that in paying his debts, he was an honorable man, and in this other matter he had nothing to conceal.

If it was not that it was certainly possible for Lawrence Washington, B. D., after he resigned from his Fellowship, to marry and have a child born to him, before Lawrence, Jr., was born, then the 1629 bugaboo deserved the prominence I have given it. But even with Mr. Washington's schedule satisfactory, there seems to be no way of being able to eliminate the ugly thing *toto cælo* as I should like to, by exposing it as fake item, a forgery and counterfeit, and the figuring on it is after all, only amusement, but it is certainly the proper thing to do.

For instance, John Washington's undated deposition, in which he gives his then age, I have said, has position in the Order Book of the Court, between two dated items, showing it should have been dated Feb., 1673-4. In this deposition, made under oath presumably, he says his age is "45, or thereabouts." We understand "thereabout" to mean near to, or close to. He might

have said, if pushed for a definite answer, aged 44 or 43, (and may have gone further up the gamut of age); but what consolation does this bring? It only places his birth in either 1628-9, or 1629-0, or 1630, or 1631, according as reckoned by O. S. or N. S. In any of these years, Lawrence Washington was "necessarily unmarried."

Again, it may have been in 1674 that "thereabouts" meant time within the fourth decade, "between 40 and 50 years of age," and "45" was the compromise date. But John, in 1674, should have been only 40, to satisfy us. Since it was possible for Mr. Washington to have married openly in Dec., 1633, and son John to have been born in August, 1634, and followed by the birth of his brother Lawrence, Jr. (tho we do not have the date of his birth; only that of his baptism), in June, 1635. With John "born August, 1634," he would be old enough in 1655, to have gone to Virginia, become a militia captain, the supercargo for Pope, of Virginia, and his mother's administrator, and we would have been satisfied. But this "Again" idea is too utopian to be accepted seriously. The Court matter in which Col. Washington's name appeared, was not a personal one, nor had his age any bearing whatever on it, therefore, his statement of his age was not a false pretense, as the giving of his age was only a matter of form.

Probably the last chance of the reduction of "45" might be found in the original entry in the Court record. But this has been tried, and "45, or thereabouts," is the correct reading of the entry.

Now what, may I ask, will enable us to exclaim: "Colonel, you were wrong. You were only 39, or 40 years old in Feb., 1673-4?"

In conclusion, I have this to say to Washington descendants, there are some features apparent in what I have reported, which are worthy of more prominence, but as they wipe out the stigma the Rev. Lawrence

seems to be under, they separate them, for a while probably, from the long Washington pedigree.

While here is proof aplenty that Lawrence was a son of the lord of Brington, and became a Fellow, a proctor, a B. D., &c., at Oxford, and then the rector of Purleigh, 1634-1643, and a diocesan surrogate, 1648-9, there is no proof that this minister was the husband of Am-
phillis Roades, or that he was the father of the children baptised at Tring church, or that he had ever resided there, or that he was the Lawrence Washington buried at Malden church.

It is only assumed that the Lawrence Washingtons who are styled "Mr." once only on the Tring parish register, and once on that of Malden, are identical with the rector of Purleigh, because a minister was thus entitled in the records of that period, but that is not enough, for to his name it was the custom to write the suffix "clerk" (especially if a B. D., Oxon.), his legal appellation in the Church of England. This may be seen in the above-mentioned Chancery suit, 1640, where he is "Mr." and "clerk." The designation of "Mr." was not sufficient to identify a man as a cleric, because, for one reason, the school teacher was styled "Master" then, and this title was abbreviated into "Mr."

Nor is there proof that the father of the children baptised at Tring, was the Lawrence Washington buried at Malden. The latter was buried in 1652, and you have read there was a Mrs. Washington whom a Commission made a beneficiary of the church and parish the Rev. Lawrence Washington was ousted from by the Cromwellians. As it was in August, 1649, it was decided to aid "the wife of the Rector" who had been "plundered," and you have seen he was a surrogate in the previous Jan. I should not be surprised if it was found sometime that this lady asking aid was then his widow, and that the former rector died between Jan.,

1648-9, and August, 1649, and that the lady was not Amphillis.

It can be seen there is good proof that the Virginians, Col. John, Lawrence and Martha Hayward, were children of Mrs. Amphillis Washington of Tring, and that "Mr. Lawrence Washington," also of Tring, 1635-41, (and several years later, it may be assumed, because two children were born after 1641), was their father, but proof is certainly required to establish that he and the minister were one and the same man.

In 1893, Mr. Waters was positive he had finished at last his many years' quest satisfactorily, by placing, as he expressed it, the right keystone in his "Washington arch," when he used the information found in the Martha Hayward will. In 1886, he had no hope nor expectation he ever would complete his undertaking, which was to justify his theory that the Rev. Lawrence Washington of Purleigh, was the husband of Amphillis, and the father of Col. John of Virginia, for he knew, as well as any of the critics of his Washington work, its weakness, namely, the lack of proper proof positive to establish beyond doubt that "the Rev. Lawrence Washington, clerk," of Purleigh, and the "Mr. Lawrence Washington" of Tring, were identical. This was his theorem, and the following items his sole proof, which he was sure made a perfect "keystone" to bind and make his perfect "arch."

One of these items is from the will of Mrs. Martha Hayward, sister of Col. John Washington, in which she mentions "my sister, Mrs. Elizabeth *Rumbold*, in England." The other item being from the will of Mrs. Mewce, a sister of the Rev. Lawrence Washington, in which she mentions "Elizabeth *Rumball*, my niece."

Mr. Waters was quick to jump at the pleasant conclusion that the two named Elizabeths were the same person, because "their surnames were the same," altho

written differently, one "Rumbold," the other "Rumball," one being the accidental perversion of the other, but he did not go so far as to venture which should be the correct surname for both.

Being self-convinced of this, he sees that Amphillis' "Mrs. Elizabeth Rumbold," being the niece of Mrs. Mewce, "Mrs. Rumbold" only could have been the daughter of Mrs. Mewce's brother, the rector of Purleigh, therefore this clergyman was the husband of Amphillis and the father of her six children.

From this deduction, the material, the "keystone" was made, and it completed the "Washington Arch," and that's all there is to this great genealogical discovery. The conjunction of the two will items is the only "proof" that the Rev. Lawrence Washington was the father of Colonel John Washington. Should it be indisputable, it leaves the clergyman and the colonel each with a "skeleton." Otherwise, in which of the numerous Washington families of England belonged the "Mr. Lawrence Washington," of Tring, Herts, 1636, who married Amphillis Roades about 1628, and was alive about 1642?

Incidentally this is the place to mention that about the time of these occurrences, there was a Washington family owning and residing at Beaches manor, in Brent-Pelham parish, Herts. The lord of this manor was Adam Washington, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, who bought this manor in 1640, owning at the time two others in the county. His wife, living in 1659, was Elizabeth, daughter of Francis Floyer, lord of Brent-Pelham manor, high sheriff of Herts, in 1648. Their daughter Margaret Washington, of Euen parish, Herts, aged 20, her parents dead, had license to marry, in 1679, William Wright.

I wish for the memory of Mr. Waters, that his deduction had been as plausible as pleasing, but we can't get away from the fact that for centuries there have

been two distinct families in England, often in the same county, called, the one Rumbold, the other Rumball; the niece was born to one, and the sister married into the other.

Because there were, and are, so many families of each of these surnames, and for want of space, I shall mention only a few instances of Rumball (having done the same for Rumbold), they being suitable to this review. As mentioned of Rumbold, Rumball, too, has had many variations, or corruptions, as Rombold;—Rumboll, Rumbell, Rumble, and even Rumbello, to match Rumbold's Romboldus.

William Rumball and wife Elizabeth had a son baptised at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, London, 22 Feb., 1662-3. "Mr. William Rumball" was buried at this church ("he died of ye Plague"), 6 July, 1665. Richard Rumball, of Great Buddon parish, Essex, widower, age 50, had license to marry, 16 May, 1661. Richard Rumball, and wife Elizabeth, had a daughter baptised 17 June, 1683, at Christ Church, New Gate, London. Buried at this church, 20 Oct., 1685, Mrs. Elizabeth Rumball, and on the 23d, Richard Rumball. Edmund Rumball, of Christ Church parish, London, aged 25, had license to marry, 15 June, 1675. John Rumball, Gent, of Shefford, Bedford, widower, age 50, had license to marry in London, 6 April, 1665.

Edward Rumball, of Fullham, Essex, Esq., age 25, had license, dated 13 Sep., 1687, to marry Lady Anne Villiers, of St. Margaret parish, Westminster, (London), age 19, daughter of the Rt. Hon. George Villiers, Lord Viscount of Grandison. The Viscount was a near relative of George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, whose half-sister Lady Anne Villiers, was the wife of Sir William Washington, of Kensington and Thistleworth, Middlesex, brother to Sir John, Rev. Lawrence, Mrs. Mewce, &c.

John Newdigate removed with his family from Lon-

don to Boston, Mass., in 1632. His son and heir, Nathaniel Newdigate, returned to London, became a merchant, and died there leaving a will, dated 22 Sep., 1668. He named his wife, Isabella, his ex'trix, and his brothers-in-law, Sir John Lewis, Edward Rumball, of the Savoy, a precinct of the Strand, London, and Edmund White, merchant of London, overseers. Among his legatees—"To Edward Rumball, and his wife, Anne, ten pounds a piece." "To my niece, Mary Rumball, five pounds." Isabella and Anne, mentioned, and Joan, wife of Sir F. Holles, were sisters of Sir John Lewis.

If it is admitted as a fact that there was always a Rumbold family and a Rumball family, it proves that "niece Rumball" was not "sister Rumbold." This agreed upon, then there is no known proof that the clergyman of Purleigh was the Mister of Tring. Therefore, the clergyman was not the father of the colonel, hence, the latter was, no doubt, born in wedlock. Otherwise, if the niece and the sister were identical, it has to be believed, through the evidence, that the colonel was illegitimate, unless we prefer to think the Fellow lived a double life, a bachelor at the University, and a married man and father somewhere else. It would not be fair to Amphilis to say she never was married, since a record of her marriage has not been found, because the circumstantial evidence of the Tring parish church register is in her favor. However, it only shows her husband was a "Mr." Lawrence Washington. Who he was it is charitable to those concerned, to say he has never been identified, therefore, the authoritative Royal Descent line of the Rev. Lawrence Washington remains in abeyance so far as Colonel John Washington of Virginia is concerned, because there is no proof he was the son of the clergyman.